

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS RELATING TO *MIRIS* AND MIRIDAE
(INSECTA, HEMIPTERA). Z.N.(S.) 1090
(see volume 21, pages 263-267; 22, pages 122-133)

By T. Jaczewski (Zoological Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw)

In connection with the recently published text of the modified proposal of I. M. Kerzhner concerning the addition to the Official List of the family-group name MIRIDAE and other names involved in the case I wish to make the following supplementary comment:

1. The new proposal of Kerzhner (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 22 : 128-133) differs in a marked way from the former proposal advanced in the original application by Kerzhner & Tryapitsin (*ibid.* 21 : 263-267).

2. Alternative C of the modified proposal, which Kerzhner seems to consider the most appropriate, means in fact a return to the practice which prevailed in hemipterological nomenclature in the period from 1888-1943 and was based to a large extent on the wrong assumption that Fabricius himself "designated" *Cimex dolabratus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type-species of *Miris* Fabricius, 1794. At the same time alternative C of the new proposal is a return to the type-species selection for *Miris* Fabricius made by Curtis in 1838, and repeated by Westwood in 1840.

3. I am unable to agree, however, that it would be a "return to Hahn's conception of the genus" (Kerzhner, *op. cit.*: 129). Hahn has never fixed a type-species for *Miris* Fabricius, and as to *Cimex dolabratus*, he placed it at first in the genus *Miris* Fabricius (*Wanz. Ins.* 2, 1834: 75-76, pl. 53, fig. 160), but Herrich-Schäffer transferred it later to the genus *Lopus* Hahn (*op. cit.* 3, 1835: 45-46, pl. 86, figs. 261-262).

4. I see also in this case no reason to apply Art. 70 of the Code as neither Latreille in 1810, nor Curtis in 1838 nor Westwood in 1840 misidentified the species they selected as type-species for *Miris* Fabricius.

5. It is, of course, for specialists in the MIRIDAE to decide whether the formally valid, first type-selection for *Miris* Fabricius made by Latreille in 1810 should be maintained, or whether the Commission should set it aside under the plenary powers and fix, following Curtis, 1838, *Cimex dolabratus* Linnaeus to be the type-species.

6. I quite agree with Kerzhner (in his modified proposal) that the second procedure would be more in accordance with the taxonomic concept of the genus *Miris* Fabricius initiated by Fallén in 1807 and accepted by most hemipterologists in the XIXth and the first half of the XXth centuries. Being no specialist in the MIRIDAE I do not feel competent to suggest whether it would be advisable to return to that concept now, after over 20 years of almost consistent use of the generic name *Miris* Fabricius in accordance with the type-species designation made by Latreille. It should be recalled, for instance, in this connection that in the recent monograph of the MIRIDAE of France (Wagner et Weber, *Faune de France*, 67, Paris, 1964) the generic name *Miris* Fabricius is used with the type-species *Cimex striatus* Linnaeus (*op. cit.*: 183).

7. As to the family-group name MIRIDAE, in case the type-species of *Miris* Fabricius should be fixed under the plenary powers as *Cimex dolabratus*, this family-group name should be also derived from the generic name conceived accordingly; in other words from the generic name *Miris* Fabricius as understood by Curtis, 1838, by Westwood, 1840, or by Reuter, 1888. The oldest family-group name based on *Miris* with type-species *dolabratus* was MIRIDES Gorski, 1852, published with a direct and unambiguous reference to *Miris* Curtis.

8. Thus, if the modified proposal of Kerzhner is accepted by the Commission, then point (5) (a) of the proposal (*op. cit.*: 133) should be replaced by the following:

- (a) MIRIDAE (correction of MIRIDES) Gorski, 1852 (type-genus *Miris* Fabricius, 1794) with a ruling that in accordance with Art. 40b of the Code it takes the date 1833 and is to be considered a senior subjective synonym and homonym of MIRIDES Hahn, [1833].

9. Point (6) (a) of the modified proposal of Kerzhner should be replaced by the following:

(a) *MIRIDES* Gorski, 1852 (an incorrect spelling for *MIRIDAE* Gorski, 1852).

10. Points (1) (c), (2) (b), (3) (c) and (5) (a) of my comment on the original proposal of Kerzhner and Tryapitsin (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 22 : 127–128) should be incorporated at appropriate places in the new proposal of Kerzhner.

SUPPORT FOR SUPPRESSION OF *XYLEBORUS* BOWDICH, 1825.

Z.N.(S.) 1720.

(see volume 22, pages 269–270)

By D. E. Bright (*Ent. Res. Inst., Canada Dept. Agric., Ottawa, Ontario*)

I fully endorse Mr. R. T. Thompson's application for suppression of *Xyleborus* Bowdich, 1825, in favor of *Xyleborus* Eichhoff, 1864. His application plainly and concisely stated the reasons for this action and I can add nothing more except my support.

Xyleborus Bowdich, 1825, described from a "worm" boring in orange trees plainly represents an unrecognizable form; in fact, it cannot be properly placed in any family.

On the other hand, *Xyleborus* Eichhoff, 1864 is an extremely common genus of Scolytidae. It is worldwide in distribution and contains at least one thousand names. The genus includes many noxious pests of agriculture and research is currently being conducted on the economic effect of numerous species in many countries. A rapid examination of the literature from 1959 to 1963 showed the following numbers of references from various regions of the world: Southeast Asia, 13; Africa, 11; Europe, 9; Orient, 2 and Central America, 1.

Although there is disagreement among authorities concerning the limits of the genus, all of them use the name *Xyleborus* in the sense of Eichhoff. These problems will gradually be resolved by more extensive studies. To follow the Law of Priority in this case would cause considerable confusion and would serve no useful purpose. In the interest of stability, I add my support to Thompson's proposal.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *ANOPHELES*

AFRICANUS THEOBALD, 1901. Z.N.(S.) 1722

(see volume 22, page 324)

By P. F. Mattingly (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I should like to support the application by Dr. Gillies for suppression of the name *Anopheles africanus* Theobald, 1901. The species in question is of no importance as a malaria vector, but it is very common and has been many times recorded in the literature under the name *obscurus*.

By J. A. Reid (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I agree with Dr. Gillies' reasons for this proposal. Namely that *africanus* is very probably a senior synonym of *obscurus* Grunberg, 1905, but that the latter is the name by which this species of mosquito has always been known, whilst *africanus* does not seem to have been used for 58 years after its first publication. Consequently, for the sake of stability it is very desirable that *africanus* should be suppressed, and I support Dr. Gillies' application.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSALS REGARDING CHRYSOPINAE IN NEUROPTERA AND DIPTERA. Z.N.(S.) 1725

(see volume 22, pages 332–333)

By D. E. Kimmins (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I would like to support the above application by Dr. Bo Tjeder in connection with the homonymy of the subfamily names based upon *Chrysopa* Leach, 1815, and *Chrysops* Meigen, 1803.